

Mark C. Mao, CA Bar No. 236165  
 Beko Reblitz-Richardson, CA Bar No. 238027  
 Erika Nyborg-Burch (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
**BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP**  
 44 Montgomery St., 41st Floor  
 San Francisco, CA 94104  
 Tel.: (415) 293-6800  
 mmao@bsflp.com  
 brichardson@bsflp.com  
 enyborg-burch@bsflp.com

James Lee (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 Rossana Baeza (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
**BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP**  
 100 SE 2nd St., 28th Floor  
 Miami, FL 33131  
 Tel.: (305) 539-8400  
 jlee@bsflp.com  
 rbaeza@bsflp.com

Amanda K. Bonn, CA Bar No. 270891  
**SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.**  
 1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
 Los Angeles, CA 90067  
 Tel: (310) 789-3100  
 Fax: (310) 789-3150  
 abonn@susmangodfrey.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CHASOM BROWN, WILLIAM BYATT,  
 JEREMY DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER  
 CASTILLO, and MONIQUE TRUJILLO  
 individually and on behalf of all similarly  
 situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

William Christopher Carmody  
 (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 Shawn J. Rabin (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 Steven M. Shepard (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 Alexander Frawley (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
**SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.**  
 1301 Avenue of the Americas,  
 32<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
 New York, NY 10019  
 Tel.: (212) 336-8330  
 bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com  
 srabin@susmangodfrey.com  
 ssh Shepard@susmangodfrey.com  
 afrawley@susmangodfrey.com

John A. Yanchunis (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 Ryan J. McGee (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
**MORGAN & MORGAN**  
 201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor  
 Tampa, FL 33602  
 Tel.: (813) 223-5505  
 jyanchunis@forthepeople.com  
 mram@forthepeople.com  
 rmcgee@forthepeople.com

Michael F. Ram, CA Bar No. 104805  
**MORGAN & MORGAN**  
 711 Van Ness Ave, Suite 500  
 San Francisco, CA 94102  
 Tel: (415) 358-6913  
 mram@forthepeople.com

Case No.: 5:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING  
 PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO  
 AMEND COMPLAINT (R. CIV. P. 15(a))**

The Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers  
 Courtroom 1 - 4th Floor  
 Date: March 15, 2022  
 Time: 2:00 p.m.

**[PROPOSED] ORDER**

Before the Court is Plaintiffs’ Rule 15(a) motion for leave to file their proposed Third Amended Complaint.

“The court should freely give leave [to amend] when justice so requires.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2). “The Supreme Court has stated that ‘this mandate is to be heeded.’” *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir. 2000) (quoting *Foman v. Davis*, 371 U.S. 178, 182 (1962)). Similarly, the Ninth Circuit has “repeatedly stressed that the court must remain guided by the underlying purpose of Rule 15 . . . to facilitate decision on the merits, rather than on the pleadings or technicalities.” *Id.* at 1127 (alteration in original). “This leave policy is applied with extreme liberality.” *Hughes v. S.A.W. Ent., Ltd.*, 2018 WL 6046461, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2018).

“The Supreme Court has identified four factors relevant to whether a motion for leave to amend should be denied: undue delay, bad faith or dilatory motive, futility of amendment, and prejudice to the opposing party.” *Meaux v. Nw. Airlines, Inc.*, 2006 WL 8459606, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. July 17, 2006) (citing *Foman*, 371 U.S. at 182). “As this circuit and others have held, it is the consideration of prejudice to the opposing party that carries the greatest weight.” *Eminence Cap., LLC v. Aspeon, Inc.*, 316 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2003) (citing *DCD Programs, Ltd. v. Leighton*, 833 F.2d 183, 185 (9th Cir. 1987)). “Absent prejudice, or a strong showing of any of the remaining *Foman* factors, there exists a *presumption* under Rule 15(a) in favor of granting leave to amend.” *Id.* (emphasis in original). As “[t]he non-moving party[, Google] bears the burden of demonstrating why leave to amend should not be granted.” *Clayborne v. Chevron Corp.*, 2020 WL 11563087, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 2, 2020) (citing *Morongo Band of Mission Indians v. Rose*, 893 F.2d 1074, 1079 (9th Cir. 1990)).

Google cannot meet its heavy burden to show why leave should be denied. Google has not established prejudice because Plaintiffs’ amendment merely conforms the class definitions to the evidence produced in discovery, and Plaintiffs do not seek to serve new discovery nor extend the case deadlines on the basis of this amendment. Nor has Google established that Plaintiffs are guilty of undue delay or bad faith, or that amendment would be futile.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers  
United States District Judge